

On page 107, in lines 8 and 29, change "Appendix A" to --Table I--.

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment is submitted under Rule 115 (37 C.F.R. § 1.115). The following comments are included in accordance with Rule 111 (37 C.F.R. § 1.111).

In the September 30, 1998 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the appendices in the present application as being improper. In accordance with the suggestion by the Examiner, the foregoing Amendment converts Appendices A and B into Tables I and II, respectively. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification has been overcome by the foregoing amendments to the specification.

Claims 8-19 are pending in the present application. On the one hand, claims 15-19 stand allowed. On the other hand, claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable as obvious in view of the disclosure in Gordon, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,195,173 (hereafter "the Gordon, et al. patent"). Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8-14 is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The Gordon, et al. patent discloses an expert system maintenance advisor system which includes an expert system module 14, a photo-library module 24, and a hypermanual module 26. A visual display screen 8 displays to a maintenance technician on-screen forms for 1) work reports and 2) ordering parts. See, the

Gordon, et al. patent column 3, lines 45-55. On the one hand, the work reports are mentioned again in columns 5 and 6 of the Gordon, et al. patent. Specifically, when a failure is detected in the equipment, the first step 50 is basically to prepare the necessary maintenance forms and record keeping to begin the troubleshooting operation. See, the Gordon, et al. patent column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 1. The system is adapted to help the maintenance technician fill out the necessary forms and complete the paperwork. See, the Gordon, et al. patent column 6, lines 4-7. Additionally, after the final test and checkout has occurred, there is a quality assurance inspection and "sign-off" step 60, involving the completion of one or more forms. See, the Gordon, et al. patent column 6, lines 58-61. However, the Gordon, et al. patent does not disclose how work report forms are accessed or completed. On the other hand, the forms for ordering parts appear to be mentioned again in column 5 of the Gordon, et al. patent. Specifically, order forms and part information are displayed on the visual display screen by the hypermanual module 24 (Block 46 shown in Fig. 4). See, the Gordon, et al. patent column 5, lines 54-56. However, the Gordon, et al. patent does not disclose how order forms are completed.

In contrast, the forms completion feature of the computer aided maintenance and repair information system in accordance with the present invention defined by claim 8 includes "means for displaying a selection list of at least one available form to be

filled in," "means for selecting a form from the list," and "means responsive to selection of the form on the list for displaying the form." Although the system disclosed in the Gordon, et al. patent mentions work report forms and forms for ordering parts, the Gordon, et al. patent does not disclose or suggest providing a selection list of available forms and enabling a maintenance technician to select a form from the list. Instead, the system disclosed in the Gordon, et al. patent appears to routinely display appropriate forms to be completed as an integral aspect of the maintenance procedure. See, the Gordon, et al. patent column 5, lines 54-56; column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 7; and column 6, lines 58-61. Consequently, the maintenance technician is not able to display a list of available forms and select from that list as provided by the system in accordance with the invention defined by claim 8.

Additionally, claim 8 recites "means for accessing data being assembled by the system for entry in the form." On the contrary, the Gordon, et al. patent discloses that work reports are apparently completed by the maintenance technician independently of "data being assembled by the system." Specifically, the Gordon, et al. patent discloses in column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 1 that "the first step 50 is basically to prepare the necessary maintenance forms and record keeping to begin the troubleshooting operation." Consequently, the appropriate forms are provided before use of the diagnostic system. This is inconsistent with the

disclosure in the Gordon, et al. patent that after the diagnostic system is in operation, the system "is adapted to help the maintenance technician fill out the necessary forms and complete the paperwork" (column 6, lines 4-7 of the Gordon, et al. patent) and "there is a quality assurance inspection and 'sign-off' step 60, involving the completion of one or more forms" (column 6, lines 59-61 of the Gordon, et al. patent). Moreover, the Gordon, et al. patent does not disclose that the data being assembled by the system is automatically entered in the form as provided by the system in accordance with the invention defined by claim 11. In fact, the disclosure in the Gordon, et al. patent suggests the contrary. Specifically, the Gordon, et al. patent discloses that "order forms and part information will be displayed on the visual display screen by the hypermanual module 24 (Block 46)" (column 5, lines 54-56 of the Gordon, et al. patent), and Fig. 1 of the Gordon, et al. patent appears to disclose separate screens for parts (second screen from top) and parts ordering forms (third screen from top).

Finally, the system in accordance with the present invention defined by claim 8 includes "an editor under control of a user for filling in the form." In paragraph 7 on page 2 of the Office Action mailed on September 30, 1998, the Examiner concedes that "Gordon et al were silent as to whether the editor [for filling in the forms] was under control of the user." Unquestionably, the Gordon, et al. patent does not disclose a user-controlled editor

for filling in information on a form in combination with "means for accessing data being assembled by the system for entry in the form," as provided by the system in accordance with the invention defined by claim 8, or, more particularly, when the system automatically enters information in the form, as provided by the system in accordance with the invention defined by claim 11.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the system in accordance with the invention defined by claims 8 and 11, and by claims 9, 10, and 12-14 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8, is distinguishable from the system disclosed in the Gordon, et al. patent. Neither the Gordon, et al. patent singly or in combination with any of the other references cited by the Examiner discloses the system in accordance with the invention defined in claims 8-14. Consequently, claims 8-14 are allowable. A notice of allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Milks, III  
William C. Milks, III  
Reg. No. 28,445

(707) 575-5336  
Santa Rosa, CA 95405  
February 26, 1999